UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,328	02/26/2004	Eric Alan Henderson	200314877-1	3980

22879   7590   05/16/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
KESSLER, MATTHEW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/16/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *2,5,6,10 and 21* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4, 7-9, 11-20, 22-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *2/26/2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-24 are pending.

2.   Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, and 21 are canceled.

3.   Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-20, and 22-24 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, and 11-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's new claims 22-24 are rejected. The Examiner argues that these new claims expand on the use of XML within the conferencing service system and method. The Examiner argues that the use of XML or any other protocol which is widely well known at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art would constitute a design choice and as such would be an obvious variation. The Examiner uses prior art to further argue this point. The structure which enables XML (i.e. XML parser) would be inherent to any system using that particular protocol and as such would also be considered obvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
       or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11, 14-15, 19-20, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Hackbarth et al. (Hackbarth, hereinafter) US Patent 7,107,312 in further

view of Richomme US Patent Application 2003/0235279 (Richomme, hereinafter).

As to claim 1, Hackbarth teaches:

An apparatus for an automatic conferencing service, the apparatus comprising:

       a service logic execution environment in a telecommunications service network (Column

4, Lines 41-44.); and

automatic conferencing service running in the service logic execution environment (Fig.2

illustrates the system architecture employed including conferencing and collaboration services.

The conferencing services are taught as running in the service logic execution environment as

they relate to the SPSF. Specifically column 4 lines 56-59 teach "the DC-MeetingServer 210 is a

commercial application which bridges calls so as to provide conferencing services including

Chat session, Application sharing, Whiteboard and video conferencing services.");

a conference coordination service logic program (SLP) as part of the automatic

conferencing service (Column 5 lines 34-39 teaches servlets which implement

requests to set up connections. It is understood that by setting up requested

connections in a conferencing system, that is the conference coordination service

logic program.);

a notification SLP as part of the automatic conferencing service, wherein the notification

SLP is configured to send conference announcement messages to devices of

conference attendees (Column 6 lines 18-39 teach showing a user's desire to

connect to one or more other users. It is understood that showing the desire to

connect is a notification from one user to another.);

wherein the conference coordination SLP is configured to send and to receive conference

request information for use in registering a conference (Column 5 lines 34-39

teach that through HTTP requests conferences are set up. Sending and receiving

information associated with the conference being set up is inherent.),

wherein the notification SLP is configured to receive from the conference coordination,

attendee information for use in notifying attendees for the conference (Column 5,

lines 34-39 teach getting information from an LDAP database. Later that

information is described in Column 6 lines 19-39 which "enables the participants

receiving data to contact each other via clicking.").

Hackbarth does not explicitly teach:

> an extensible markup language (XML) parser as part of the automatic conferencing
>
> > service; and
>
> wherein the conference coordination SLP is configured to send an **XML document to**
>
> > **the XML parser**, and to receive conference request information **from the XML**
> >
> > **parser** for use in registering a conference,
>
> wherein the notification SLP is configured to receive **the XML document** from the
>
> > conference coordination SLP, **to send the XML document to the XML parser,**
> >
> > and to receive attendee information **from the XML parser** for use in notifying
> >
> > attendees for the conference.

Although Hackbarth does not teach using XML for the conferencing functions, it would

be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the structure of the

data which is sent and received to enable conferencing to use XML. Hackbarth teaches all of the

structural limitation of claim 1 including an SLEE with SLPs which perform the conferencing

and notification services.

However Richomme teaches the use of XML as part of the automatic conferencing

service (Paragraph [0011] teaches "The monitoring information is first transmitted to the

conference server. At the conference server the monitoring information is adjusted so that this

information can be sent in the form of a programming language code which is executable by the

participants' Web terminal devices. For example, the monitoring information may be encoded in JavaScript, HTTP, or XML (extended markup language) as many a browser can execute JavaScript code or XML code."). In light of Richomme's teaching it is obvious that XML can be one of the coding methods for sending information within the SLEE. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to us XML, including an XML parser which is inherent to any system using XML, in the conference coordination and notification within the automatic conferencing services.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use XML for these services because as Richomme states "the monitoring information may be encoded in JavaScript, HTTP, or XML (extended markup language) as many a browser can execute JavaScript code or XML code." It is clear from Richomme's disclosure that it was widely well known and used at the time of the invention to use XML within web services and using XML would simply be a design choice which could be used to implement automatic conferencing services.

Furthermore it would be obvious to use XML since XML is only providing a way for the information to be received from one SLP to another. Since messages containing information are being sent from one SLP to another in Hackbarth's teaching, it would be obvious to use the XML to structure the data that is being sent. Hackbarth is silent on how the data is structured, but it would be obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use XML as an option for the data structure.

As to claim 3, Hackbarth further teaches:

wherein the automatic conferencing service module~ further include claim 1, further

comprising an HTTP interface as part of the automatic conferencing service (Column 5 lines 20-

36 teaches an HTTP interface.).

As to claim 4, Hackbarth further teaches:

wherein the HTTP interface comprises an HTTP server plug-in module and an HTTP

dispatcher module, and wherein the HTTP dispatcher module is configured to receive a setup

conference request, create an instance of the conference coordination service logic program, and

forward the setup conference request to the conference coordination service logic program to be

processed (Column 5 lines 20-36 describes the interaction of the user agent as using HTTP in

conjunction to the SPSF. It is understood that the communication between the SPSF and the

User Agent use a HTTP server plug-in module as well as a HTTP dispatcher module. Further in

Column 5 lines 34-39 the servlets set up the requested conference, and the conference actually

happens and the attendees are notified of the conference, i.e. the request is forwarded to the

conference coordination SLP.).

As to claim 7, Hackbarth teaches:

wherein the automatic conferencing service modules further include claim 1, further

comprising a home location register service logic program as part of the automatic conferencing

service, wherein the home location register service logic program is configured to update device

online status for the devices of conference attendees, and wherein the notification service logic

program is further configured to read said device online status for the devices of conference

attendees (Column 6 lines 18-39 teach that "a ConnectIcon View 215 is a virtual entity stating

one user's desire to connect to one or more other users." It is also taught that presence status

information of the users is available.).

As to claim 8, Hackbarth further teaches:

wherein the automatic conferencing service modules further include claim 1, further

comprising a billing service logic program as part of the automatic conferencing service program

(Column 4 line 67 teaches that the SPSF has billing functionality.).

As to claim 9, Hackbarth teaches:

A method of scheduling an automatic conference (The title of Hackbarth teaches an

"Apparatus and method for use in a data/conference call system for automatically collecting

participant information and providing all participants with that information for use in

collaboration services". The user making the request to start a conference is taught in column 20

lines 44-47), the method comprising:

reception of a conference request, including conference information specified by a user,

by a conference coordination service logic program (SLP) of an automatic

conferencing service running in a service logic execution environment within a

telecommunications network (Hackbarth teaches in column 3 line 66 to column 4

line 9 that "the service framework 201 is a Service Logic Execution Environment

that is responsible for responding to requests for service and initializing

connections between endpoints. The SPFS SLEE is implemented as a set of Java

classes running in a Java Virtual Machine." Hackbarth teaches a request being

received in column 20 lines 55-57 as "the conference server acknowledges

reservation request." Lastly the title teaches this is a telecommunications network

as it states "Apparatus and method for use in a data/conference call system...");

registration of the conference by the automatic conferencing service conference

coordination SLP which extracts conference information from the XML

document using an XML parser (Hackbarth teaches a request being received in

column 20 lines 55-57 as "the conference server acknowledges reservation

request." By sending an acknowledgement for a reservation request it is

understood that the conference is registered and the users are registered as well.);

and

notification of attendees of the conference by the automatic conferencing service

notification SLP which extracts attendee information from the XML document

using the XML parser (Column 6 lines 18-39 teach that "a ConnectIcon View 215

is a virtual entity stating one user's desire to connect to one or more other users."

It is understood that showing the desire to connect is a notification from one user

to another. It is a notification service logic program that notifies one user's

request to another user.).

Hackbarth does not explicitly teach:

reception of a conference request, including conference information specified by a user **in**

an extensible markup language (XML) document,

registration of the conference by the automatic conferencing service conference

coordination SLP which extracts conference information **from the XML document using an**

XML parser;

notification of attendees of the conference by the automatic conferencing service

notification SLP which extracts attendee information **from the XML document using the XML**

parser.

Although Hackbarth does not teach using XML for the conferencing functions, it would

be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the structure of the

data which is sent and received to enable conferencing to use XML. Hackbarth teaches all of the

structural limitation of claim 1 including an SLEE with SLPs which perform the conferencing

and notification services including the steps of registration, reception and notification.

However Richomme teaches the use of XML as part of the automatic conferencing

service (Paragraph [0011] teaches "The monitoring information is first transmitted to the

conference server. At the conference server the monitoring information is adjusted so that this

information can be sent in the form of a programming language code which is executable by the

participants' Web terminal devices. For example, the monitoring information may be encoded in

JavaScript, HTTP, or XML (extended markup language) as many a browser can execute

JavaScript code or XML code."). In light of Richomme's teaching it is obvious that XML can be

one of the coding methods for sending information within the SLEE. Therefore it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to us XML, including

an XML parser which is inherent to any system using XML, in the conference coordination and

notification within the automatic conferencing services.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use XML for these services because as Richomme states "the monitoring information may be encoded in JavaScript, HTTP, or XML (extended markup language) as many a browser can execute JavaScript code or XML code." It is clear from Richomme's disclosure that it was widely well known and used at the time of the invention to use XML within web services and using XML would simply be a design choice which could be used to implement automatic conferencing services.

Furthermore it would be obvious to use XML since XML is only providing a way for the information to be received from one SLP to another. Since messages containing information are being sent from one SLP to another in Hackbarth's teaching, it would be obvious to use the XML to structure the data that is being sent. Hackbarth is silent on how the data is structured, but it would be obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use XML as an option for the data structure.

As to claim 11, Hackbarth further teaches:

wherein the conference information includes time and attendee information (Column 5 lines 34-40 teach the requests to set up connections and mentions calendar and LDAP information. It is understood that calendar information is time and the LDAP database stores the information about the attendees.).

As to claim 14, Hackbarth further teaches:

determination of an online status of a communication device of an attendee (Column 5 lines 6-10 teach that the "User Agent 203 is central to the provision of collaborative services.

User Agent 203 is responsible for maintaining presence data, i.e., information, for the registered

clients. It maintains lists of subscribers and notifies subscribers of changes in status.").

As to claim 15, Hackbarth further teaches:

> wherein the online status determination is accomplished by way of a lookup to a home

location register database (Column 5 lines 10-19 teach that "the User Agent 203 maintains a

LDAP database 206 in which presence information is maintained for each individual registered

with the system. It also supports Presence Clients that register with it. These clients include

TeamPortal View 214, ConnectIcon View 215, and OpenChannel View 217. Presence Clients

are Java classes that run remotely and can both report changes in presence status and react to

User Agent messages telling them that the Presence information has changed for a user they have

defined as being in their awareness set." It is interpreted that the LDAP database is a home

location register database as they both store the status information of a user.).

As to claim 19, Hackbarth further teaches:

> accessing a directory by the automatic conferencing service to obtain a preference profile

for an attendee (Column 5 lines 6-33 teach the "User Agent 203 is central to the provision of

collaborative services. User Agent 203 is responsible for maintaining presence data, i.e.,

information, for the registered clients." It is interpreted that storing information about the user is

a preference profile for an attendee. Additionally column 5 lines 27-29 teach that "the User

Agent 203 uses a LDAP database 206 to store the data, but direct access to the database is not

necessary." It is clear that this information is being accessed whether directly or indirectly.).

As to claim 20, Hackbarth further teaches:

wherein the directory is accessed using a lightweight directory access protocol interface

(Column 5 lines 27-29 teach that "the User Agent 203 uses a LDAP database 206 to store the

data" and it is understood that the LDAP database would be accessed with a LDAP interface.).

As to claim 22, Hackbarth teaches:

A method of scheduling an automatic conference, the method comprising:

sending a request to schedule a conference from a browser to a web server;

communicating said request from the web server to high-availability telecommunications

equipment (Column 3:22- 4:18 teach requests, 4:4-5, being sent from endpoints. One endpoint is

described as a web server, 4:15.);

providing [the request] to a conference coordination service logic program (SLP)

(Column 4:56-67 teaches the use of coordination software.);

registering a conference with a unique conference identifier (Column 11:45) and setting

timers (Column 11:50) by the conference coordination SLP; and

returning a notification, including the unique conference identifier, by the conference

coordination SLP to the browser (Column 4:9-19 teaches the browser in conjunction with the

Web server. It is understood that the web server which is processing the requests through the

SLEE which also interfaces with the browser and also displays presence information also

displays notification of the conference including the identifier.)

returning a notification, including the unique conference identifier, by the conference

coordination SLP via the HTTP interface and the web server to the browser (Column 5 lines 20-

36).

Hackbarth does not teach the use of XML explicitly. The Steps which are directly related to

XML are highlighted in bold below:

communicating said request from the web server to high-availability telecommunications

equipment **by way of a hyper text transfer protocol (HTTP) server plug-in**;

sending an extensible markup language (XML) document from the HTTP server

plug-in to an HTTP dispatcher;

providing **the XML document from the HTTP dispatcher** to a conference coordination

service logic program (SLP);

providing the XML document from the conference coordination SLP to an XML

parser;

parsing the XML document by the XML parser to obtain conference request

information;

returning the conference request information **obtained from the XML document** to the

conference coordination SLP;

However, using XML to send information in between the browser, Web server,

coordination SLP, and notification SLP would have been well known and obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Not only that, but Hackbarth suggests in

Column 3:23-46 that "The collaboration services, in accordance with the invention, are

implemented utilizing Application and Media Servers 102 supported through the Softswitch

Programmable Feature Server (SPFS). The SPFS is a programmable converged voice and data

services platform for packet networks" and the "SPFS services are provided to intelligent soft

endpoints utilizing multimedia enabled protocols, such as Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) and

H.323, and a WEB server interface to services."

The Examiner argues that using HTTP and XML are design choices using such protocols

would be and obvious variation to whichever specific protocols Hackbarth uses. Furthermore the

limitations which recite the HTTP and XML language add structure that would be inherent to

any system which uses these protocols and as such would be an obvious, design choice variation.

Any system which does use XML would of course use an XML parser which parses information.

Any system which uses HTTP would of course employ an HTTP dispatcher. As such, it would

be obvious to perform these steps if XML and HTTP were chosen to be used as the protocols to

communicate information between the browser, web server, and the SLPs.

For further evidence, the Examiner points out that Richomme teaches the use of XML in

a conference coordination system. Paragraph [0011] teaches "The monitoring information is

first transmitted to the conference server. At the conference server the monitoring information is

adjusted so that this information can be sent in the form of a programming language code which

is executable by the participants' Web terminal devices. For example, the monitoring information

may be encoded in JavaScript, HTTP, or XML (extended markup language) as many a browser

can execute JavaScript code or XML code."). In light of Richomme's teaching it is obvious that

XML can be one of the coding methods for sending information within the SLEE. Therefore it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to us

XML, including an XML parser which is inherent to any system using XML, in the conference

coordination and notification within the automatic conferencing services.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use XML for these

services because as Richomme states "the monitoring information may be encoded in JavaScript,

HTTP, or XML (extended markup language) as many a browser can execute JavaScript code or

XML code." It is clear from Richomme's disclosure that it was widely well known and used at

the time of the invention to use XML within web services and using XML would simply be a

design choice which could be used to implement automatic conferencing services.

As to claim 23 Hackbarth further teaches:

sending [attendee information] from the conference coordination SLP to a notification

SLP (LDAP information is looked up and sent);

providing the attendee information from the notification SLP to a home location register

(HLR) SLP;

looking-up a current online status of attendees by the HLR SLP;

returning the current online status of the attendees from the HLR SLP to the notification

SLP ;

sending the current online status of the attendees from the notification SLP to the

conference coordination SLP; and

sending an in-progress response from the conference coordination SLP the HTTP

interface and the web server to the browser (Column 5 lines 10-19 teach that "the User Agent

203 maintains a LDAP database 206 in which presence information is maintained for each

individual registered with the system. It also supports Presence Clients that register with it. These

clients include TeamPortal View 214, ConnectIcon View 215, and OpenChannel View 217.

Presence Clients are Java classes that run remotely and can both report changes in presence

status and react to User Agent messages telling them that the Presence information has changed

for a user they have defined as being in their awareness set." It is interpreted that the LDAP

database is a home location register database as they both store the status information of a user.

The presence information is looked up, returned and sent. In Column 5 lines 34-39 Hackbarth

teaches sending information via HTTP from SLP to SLP.).

Once again the Examiner exerts that the use of XML to communicate information with in

the system is a design choice, but the rejection is further supported by Richomme (see claim 22)

with the same motivation to combine.

As to claim 24, Hackbarth further teaches:

sending notice messages from the notification SLP to a plurality of attendees;

sending a response from the notification SLP to the conference coordination SLP,

wherein the response indicates that the notice messages were sent to the plurality of attendees;

transmitting a response indicating that the notice messages were sent from the conference

coordination SLP the HTTP interface and the web server to the browser (Column 5 lines 10-19

teach that "the User Agent 203 maintains a LDAP database 206 in which presence information is

maintained for each individual registered with the system. It also supports Presence Clients that

register with it. These clients include TeamPortal View 214, ConnectIcon View 215, and

OpenChannel View 217. Presence Clients are Java classes that run remotely and can both report

changes in presence status and react to User Agent messages telling them that the Presence

information has changed for a user they have defined as being in their awareness set." It is

interpreted that the presence information are the messages being sent. They are sent to a

plurality of attendees. In Column 5 lines 34-39 Hackbarth teaches sending information via

HTTP from SLP to SLP.); and

sending a billing record document from the conference coordination SLP to a billing SLP

(Column 4 line 67 teaches that the SPSF has billing functionality.).

Once again the Examiner exerts that the use of XML to communicate information with in

the system is a design choice, but the rejection is further supported by Richomme (see claim 22)

with the same motivation to combine.

5.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination

of Hackbarth and Richomme as applied to claim 9 in further view of Haimovich et al. US Patent

Application Number 2005/0031110 (hereinafter Haimovich).

The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme teach all of the limitations of the method

of claim 9, but does not teach wherein a user specifies the conference information using a phone

to access an interactive voice response interface to the automatic conferencing service.

However in an analogous art, Haimovich teaches wherein a user specifies the conference

information using a phone to access an interactive voice response interface to the automatic

conferencing service (Paragraph [0020] teaches "A telecommunications carrier, having the

capability of providing a conference call service, links the regular telephone number or a

specifically assigned telephone number of a subscriber utilizing a communication station (i.e., a

telephone instrument), and who is desirous of the conference call service, to a subscriber-specific

conference call box. The conference call box is a data structure implemented in a conference call

database within the telecommunications carrier's network designed to store operational

information functional in the setting up and the establishment of a conference call. Dialing the

regular telephone number or dialing a specifically coded dialing sequence will affect the

performance of a pre-defined procedure comprising a variable sequence of functional steps by

the network before the network could establish a functional connection. The functional sequence

of steps is performed in order to offer the caller a selection of an option out of several pre-

defined options associated with the telephone number representing the called communications

station. The network sequence is implemented by the utilization of a set of specifically

developed software programs, supported by an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) interface, by

suitable data structures, and by appropriate Application Specific Integrated Circuits (ASICs)." It

is understood that through the "IVR", the user selects the "operation information functional in

setting up and establishing of a conference call".).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's method of claim 9 with

Haimovich's method where a user specifies the conference information using a phone to access

an interactive voice response interface to the automatic conferencing service because as

Haimovich states in paragraph [0045] the advantages of the method of the present invention

"will affect significant savings in time, expenses, and organizational effort." This would be

accomplished as it leverages existing telephonic communication systems currently employed.

6.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme as applied to claim 9 in further view of Sato et al. US Patent Application Number 2003/0055893 (hereinafter Sato).

The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme teaches all of the limitations of the method of claim 9, but does not teach further comprising setting timers for the conference by the automatic conferencing service.

However in an analogous art, Sato teaches further comprising setting timers for the conference by the automatic conferencing service (Paragraph [0045] teaches "FIGS. 11A and 11B are flowcharts for automatically holding a conference at the time specified by electronic mail sent by the parameter management unit 72 and the time management unit 74 installed to the collaboration system 60 shown in FIG. 5." Additionally paragraph [0045] teaches "By activation of the timer by setting of the conference starting time as described above, at the step S105, the notification event takes place from the timer when the specified time comes, and the collaboration system 60-2 that received the notification of the conference starting time from the timer at the step S106 starts connecting to the received IP address, so that a conference can automatically begin at the specified time.").

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's method of claim 9 with Sato's setting of timers for the conference because Sato gives the reason for setting the timers is "so that a conference can automatically begin at the specified time."

7.   Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The

combination of Hackbarth and Richomme as applied to claim 9 in further view of Matus et al.

US Patent Application Number 2004/0010549 (hereinafter Matus).

        As to claim 16, The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme teach all of the limitations

of claim 9, but does not teach wherein an attendee is notified by way of electronic mail.

        However in an analogous art, Matus teaches wherein an attendee is notified by way of

electronic mail (Paragraph [0012] teaches "the system can also send a text message, such as for

example via SMS, MMS, email, or instant messenger, to notify participants of an impending

phone call or to request that they call a specific number or take another specific action.").

        Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's method of automatic

conferencing with notification with Matus's method of notification through email because as

Matus states "the present invention allows a user to easily configure conference calls via a

wireless device." Notification is a part of the automatic conferencing system and notifying

someone by a method which they list several alternatives would be an obvious improvement to

the already present notification presented by The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's

method and system.

        As to claim 17, The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme teach all of the limitations

of claim 9, but does not teach wherein an attendee is notified by way of an SMS message.

However in an analogous art, Matus teaches wherein an attendee is notified by way of an SMS message (Paragraph [0012] teaches "the system can also send a text message, such as for example via SMS, MMS, email, or instant messenger, to notify participants of an impending phone call or to request that they call a specific number or take another specific action.").

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's method of automatic conferencing with notification with Matus's method of notification through an SMS message because as Matus states "the present invention allows a user to easily configure conference calls via a wireless device." Notification is a part of the automatic conferencing system and notifying someone by a method which they list several alternatives would be an obvious improvement to the already present notification presented by The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's method and system.

As to claim 18, The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme teaches all of the limitations of claim 9, but does not teach wherein an attendee is notified by way of an instant message.

However in an analogous art, Matus teaches wherein an attendee is notified by way of an instant message (Paragraph [0012] teaches "the system can also send a text message, such as for example via SMS, MMS, email, or instant messenger, to notify participants of an impending phone call or to request that they call a specific number or take another specific action.").

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's method of automatic

conferencing with notification with Matus's method of notification through an instant message because as Matus states "the present invention allows a user to easily configure conference calls via a wireless device." Notification is a part of the automatic conferencing system and notifying someone by a method which they list several alternatives would be an obvious improvement to the already present notification presented by The combination of Hackbarth and Richomme's method and system.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Kessler whose telephone number is (571) 270-5005. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:00 am - 5:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)272-3933. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MEK/

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145